

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA  
Civil No. 12-949 (DSD/FLN)

William Richard Iverson,  
  
Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER**

State of Minnesota, Attorney  
General State of Minnesota,  
Minnesota Department of Human  
Services, United States of  
America - President, Doctor Lori  
Sills, Doctor Anderson, Chad  
Portner, Scott Shelley, David S.  
Proffitt, William Gallagher,  
Doctor Jeffrey Haun, Thad  
Shunkwiler, Thanhson Nguyen-  
Kelly, Julie Roehm, Doctor Embury,  
Richard Hoffman, John  
Rauenhorst, Gordon Larson,  
Kristin Dehrkoop, Alan Q. Radke,  
Jennifer Services, all or any  
other Government Officials  
whom have mislead investigation  
of maltreatment, etc., and  
President of the United States  
of America - Executive-  
Legislative - Judicial Branches  
of Government and/or Allies  
whom exist that thwart the  
progress of mental illness of  
patients confined in their  
territories and/or countries,

Defendants.

This matter is before the court upon the pro se objection by plaintiff William Richard Iverson to the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge. The magistrate judge recommends summary dismissal based on failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Iverson timely objected. The court reviews the report

and recommendation de novo. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); D. Minn. LR 72.2(b).

Iverson is a person civilly committed as mentally ill and dangerous by the state of Minnesota. The bases of his largely incoherent objections appear to be his dislike of certain medications and the alleged record of one defendant, David S. Proffitt, while employed in Maine. Disagreement with medical treatment does not constitute a constitutional violation. Nothing in the complaint or objection suggests that defendants prescribed or administered medications with deliberate indifference to Iverson's needs.

After a de novo review, the court finds that the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge is well reasoned and correctly disposes of the application and motion. Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. The objection is overruled;
2. The report and recommendation [ECF No. 8] is adopted in full;
3. The application to proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2] is denied;
4. The motion for a temporary restraining order [ECF No. 3] is denied; and

5. This action is summarily dismissed.

**LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

Dated: July 16, 2012

s/David S. Doty  
David S. Doty, Judge  
United States District Court